

**REMARKS**

This paper, and the accompanying *Request for Continued Examination*, is responsive to the *Final Rejection* that issued on March 18, 2010. In the *Final Rejection*, all pending claims were rejected as follows:

- (1) Claims 1-16 and 19-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over "P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide" (hereinafter "P-Synch") in view of U.S. Publication 2005/0102534 to Wong and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,043,521 to Eitel.
- (2) Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over P-Synch in view of Wong and further in view of Eitel, and further in view of "About Metacrawler" (hereinafter, "Metacrawler").

In response, claims 1, 20, 21, and 27 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found at paragraphs [0040] and [0078] and elsewhere in the Specification.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 1-16 and 19-27**

Claims 1-16 and 19-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over P-Synch in view of Wong and further in view of Eitel.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:

receiving a proposed password from a user;

performing an Internet search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from the proposed password by using a search engine tool; and

rejecting the proposed password when more than one web page retrieved by the search engine tool contain both the proposed password and another string that is determined based on a rule for the selection of passwords.

*(emphasis added)*

Neither P-Synch nor Wong or Eitel teach or suggest, alone or in combination, what claim 1, as amended, recites — namely, *the rejection of a proposed password when the number of*

retrieved web pages that contain a keyword from the query **and another** string exceeds a threshold.

The password validation technique of claim 1 comprises three (3) salient tasks:

- (1) perform an Internet search,
- (2) count the number of pages that are retrieved by the search, that contain both a keyword from the query and **another string**, and
- (3) reject a password based on the count.

In other words, in the present invention, passwords are rejected on the basis of the **cardinality of a subset of the search results**.

Eitel teaches an invention where the **cardinality of the full set of search results** is measured. In Eitel, a search agent is uploaded to a website and executed. The agent performs searches that result in the production of search reports. After a search is performed, the agent counts the number of records in the search report for that search.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office cited col. 6, line 46 — col. 7, line 3 of Eitel:

At the end of a first search level, the search agent 30 would determine **the number of records** in the search report. if the number exceeded some arbitrary minimum threshold value, the search agent 30 would go to the next search level 200 and continue to process search terms, either until all the search terms have been processed or until the number of records is below the minimum threshold.

When all the search terms have been processed 202, or **the number of records is below some threshold** 230, a comparison is made to determine whether the search report meets 236 the search criteria. The search report may not meet the search criteria because there are too many or too few records in the search report. Where the search report meets the search criteria, the search report may be sent 242 to the searcher.

Where the search report does not meet the search criteria, the searched site may return a help query 228 to the searcher at the searching terminal 12. The help query may be in the form of a summary search report webpage showing the reason why the search report did not meet the search report criteria. Where the **search report included too many records**, the query may show the number of records found and the maximum records permitted by the search criteria. Similarly, **where the search report contains too few records**, the query may include indication of the number of records found.

The passage cited by the Office shows that Eitel is concerned with how many records are contained in a search report ("web pages retrieved by the Internet search", per claim 1). Claim 1, in contrast, is concerned with how many of the records in the search report ("web pages retrieved by the Internet search", per claim 1) meet a specific condition ("*contain both the proposed password and the other string*", per claim 1).

For these reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over P-Synch, Wong, and Eitel.

Because claims 2-19 depend on claim 1, they are likewise allowable. The recitation of additional limitations in them provides further grounds for their patentability.

Dependent claim 20, as amended, recites:

20. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the search engine employs a number classification, ***wherein the number classification identifies usage of one or more numbers found in a web page.***

*(emphasis supplied)*

The specification discusses the claimed subject matter at paragraph [0078]:

[0078] Number classification techniques can also optionally be employed to reduce the number of false hits. Number classification techniques can be employed to ensure that the hits from a search are due to the proper type of numbers (or other information). For example, in the exemplary telephone number implementation, the number classification techniques can be employed to ensure that the hits from a search are due to telephone numbers. The present invention recognizes that the numbers (area code, prefix, telephone number) hit by mistake tend to have a different usage, such as publication page numbers, identification numbers or portions thereof, or dates.

In rejecting claim 20, the Office cited the digit rules found on page 125 of P-Synch. The digit rules, however, do not teach the number classification of claim 20. They have nothing to do with usage of numbers (e.g., whether the number is used as a telephone number prefix or page number, etc.), rather they have to do with the numbers' format.

For the purposes of reference, the digit rules are reproduced below:

Minimum no. of digits	Req/Warn	The smallest number of digits that a legal password must have.
Minimum no. of digits inside	Req/Warn	Same as minimum digits, but not counting the first or last character of the password.

The rules of P-Synch pertain to number format. They do not pertain to number usage. Therefore, they do not read on the limitation "number classification, **wherein the number classification identifies usage of one or more numbers found in a web page.**"

In light of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is allowable over P-Synch, Wong, and Eitel.

Claim 21, as amended, recites:

21. An apparatus comprising:  
a memory; and  
at least one processor, coupled to the memory, operative to:  
receive a proposed password from a user;  
perform an Internet search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from the proposed password, by using a search engine tool; and  
reject the proposed password based on the number of web pages retrieved by the search engine tool that contain both the proposed password and another string that is determined based on a rule for the selection of passwords, wherein the proposed password is rejected **when the number of web pages retrieved by the search engine tool, that contain both the proposed password and the other string, exceeds a threshold**, and wherein the threshold is greater than one.  
*(emphasis supplied)*

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the claim 21 is allowable over P-Synch, Wong, and Eitel.

Because claims 22-26 depend on claim 21, they are likewise allowable. The recitation of additional subject matter in them provides further grounds for their patentability.

Claim 27, as amended, recites:

27. (Previously Presented) An article of manufacture for evaluating a password proposed by a user, comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps of:

- receive the proposed password from the user; and
- performing an Internet search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from the proposed password,-by using a search engine tool; and
- rejecting the proposed password based on the number of web pages retrieved by the search engine tool that contain both the proposed password and another string that is determined based on a rule for the selection of passwords, wherein the proposed password is rejected ***when the number of web pages retrieved by the search engine tool, that contain both the proposed password and the other string, exceeds a threshold***, and wherein the threshold is greater than one.

*(emphasis supplied)*

For the same reasons as for claims 1 and 21, the applicants respectfully submit that the claim 27 is allowable over P-Synch, Wong, and Eitel.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of claim 17**

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over P-Synch in view of Wong and further in view of Eitel, and further in view of Metacrawler.

Because claim 17 depends on claim 1, and because Metacrawler fails to cure the deficiencies of P-Synch, Wong, and Eitel with respect to claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 17 is overcome.

### **Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111**

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,  
Amit Bagga et al.

By **/Kiril Dimov/**  
Kiril Dimov  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 60490  
732-578-0103 x215

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.  
Suite 250  
100 Commons Way  
Holmdel, NJ 07733  
United States of America